IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR

FRIDAY, THE 28TH SEPTEMBER 2007 / 6TH ASWINA 1929

RP.No. 799 of 2007(H)

JUDGEMENT IN WPC.16033/2007
.....

REVIEW PETITIONER/PETITIONER

C.JOY, S/O. CHACKO, AGED 54 YEARS,
1ST GRADE DRAFTSMAN, BLOCK DEVELOPMENT OFFICE,
CHAVARA, KOLLAM DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.R.PARAMESWARAN NAIR

RESPONDENTS/RESPONDENTS:
----

1. STATE OF KERALA, REPRESENTED BY
THE SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,
GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

2. CHIEF ENGINEER,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ENGINEER OF PWD
ADMINISTRATION, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

3. BLOCK DEVELOPMENT OFFICER,
BLOCK DEVELOPMENT OFFICE, CHAVARA,
KOLLAM DISTRICT.

4. PRESIDENT,
CHAVARA BLOCK PANCHAYATH, CHAVARA,
KOLLAM DISTRICT.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI. LAKSHMI NARAYANAN

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 28/09/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR

RP NO.799 OF 2007-H in WPC 16033/07

Order

The writ petitioner is the review petitioner. He is a First Grade Draftsman. he has been transferred by Ext.P1 order from the Block Development Office, Chavara to Thodupuzha. This Court called for the records and examined the file leading to the transfer of the petitioner. It was found that he has been transferred out on the basis of the request of the steering committee of the Chavara Block Panchayat and also the request letter addressed by the President of the Panchayat. So, this Court took the view that the petitioner has been transferred in public interest. Therefore, without prejudice to his right to represent against the transfer, the Writ Petition was dismissed. Now, the petitioner points out that there was no complaint against him from the public and the allegations made against him by the steering committee are unfounded and baseless. So, his transfer from Chavara to Thodupuzha is unwarranted. It is made clear that the Judgment under review will not stand in the way of the petitioner, raising all his contentions in his representation against the transfer before the competent authority and the said

authority considering them on merits. If the petitioner's contentions in this regard are found correct, the competent authority can grant reliefs to him also. With the above observations, the RP is closed.

28.09.2007 **K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR,JUDGE**

sta